

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for admitting that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter. All other claims in this application remain rejected by the Office Action. In response to the Office Action, applicants submit the following remarks and respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7 under Section 103(a) should be withdrawn

Claims 1, 3-5, 7 were rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,873 issued to Adams, III (hereinafter “Adams”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,081 issued to Podell (hereinafter “Podell”). Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Adams discloses a circuit for isolating an appliance receiving radio frequency (RF) broadcast signals from electrical hazard. Adams’ circuit (Fig. 6) comprises a transformer (620) whose primary windings are coupled to a connector (610) of a coaxial cable. The circuit also contains a shunt device (660), also coupled to the primary windings of the transfer 620, for protecting the connector against voltage surge.

Podell teaches a circuit for protecting the input and output terminals of microwave circuits from excessive voltages. The circuit contains a MESEFT transistor for shunting the excessive voltage to ground.

Neither Adam nor Podell teaches a normally off bi-directional transistor coupled to a balanced circuit. Specifically, Fig. 6 of Adams discloses a shunt device (660) coupled to an unbalanced circuit (620). Fig. 1 of Podell also discloses a MESEFT transistor (24) coupled to an unbalanced circuit 12. Furthermore, nothing in the disclosure of Adams or Podell teaches or suggests a shunt device or FET coupled to a balanced circuit.

By contrast, pending independent claim 1 expressly requires a normally-off bidirectional transistor coupled to a balanced circuit. Pending independent claim 7 expressly requires coupling a balanced transient signal to a bidirectional transistor. Claims 3-5 depend on claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5 and 7 under section 103 be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 2 and 8 under Section 103(a) should be withdrawn

Claims 2 and 8 were rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Adams, in view of Podell, and further in view of Vasile. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that Adams, Podell and Vasile are not analogous art and thus can not be combined in a 103 rejection. As applicants explained in the previous response, Vasile does not disclose a method and apparatus for a circuit against over-voltage. Instead, Vasile discloses a circuit for performing multiple mathematical operations comprising a normally-on FET. It expressly notes that the amplitudes of the input signals are understood to be small. See, e.g. col. 7, lines 25-27. This feature of Vasile argues against interpreting it as a protection circuit. In contrast, Adams and Podell both disclose over-voltage protection circuits having normally-off shunt devices or MESFETs. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2 and 8 under section 103 be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning this submission, or any aspect of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

No fee is believed due at this time. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2004



Steven K. Fukuda (Reg. No. 44,690)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10178-0060
(212) 309-6623